

Report CR-1095-01-79

Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Manpower Projection Methodology

**Study Documentation Report
Revised SAMAS Instructions**

19970417 122

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release,
Distribution Unlimited

May 1979

OPERATIONS ANALYSIS GROUP

**GENERAL
RESEARCH**



CORPORATION

A SUBSIDIARY OF FLOW GENERAL INC.

7655 Old Springhouse Road, McLean, Virginia 22102

Submitted To:

Office of The Assistant Secretary of Defense
(MRA & L) (PM)

Room 3D-970, The Pentagon
Washington, D. C., 20301

Contract MDA903-79-C-0211

LOG NO. 78085
COPY 16 OF COPIES
GRC, McLEAN, VA.

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

Report CR-1095-01-79

Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Manpower Projection Methodology

Study Documentation Report Revised SAMAS Instructions

By:
R. L. Somers
J. Loomer
A. M. Rosie
A. Uscher

May 1979

OPERATIONS ANALYSIS GROUP

**GENERAL
RESEARCH**  **CORPORATION**

A SUBSIDIARY OF FLOW GENERAL INC.

7655 Old Springhouse Road, McLean, Virginia 22102

Submitted To:

Office of The Assistant Secretary of Defense
(MRA & L) (PM)
Room 3D-970, The Pentagon
Washington, D. C., 20301

Contract MDA903-79-C-0211

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Manpower Projection Methodology | | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Study Documentation Report Feb-May 1979 |
| | | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER |
| 7. AUTHOR(s) Richard L. Somers Arthur Uscher James R. Loomé Alexander M. Rosie | | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) MDA903-79-C-0211 |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS General Research Corporation 7655 Old Springhouse Road McLean, VA 22102 | | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS DASD(PM) OASD(MRA&L) The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20310 | | 12. REPORT DATE 31 May 1979 |
| | | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) | | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified |
| | | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for open literature Copies to: OASD(MRA&L)-5 | | |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) | | |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None | | |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Foreign Military Sales Security Assistance Manpower Accounting Manpower Projection | | |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) General Research Corporation has developed guidance and procedures for accounting for security assistance manpower. This project has the dual purposes of: developing a means for forecasting future year manpower requirements for foreign military sales; and, for improving the current Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS) and the accuracy and validity of Service reports into the system. This report is concerned primarily with improvements to the current SAMAS. | | |

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

CONTENTS

| <u>SECTION</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1-1 |
| | Objective | 1-1 |
| | Organization of This Report | 1-1 |
| 2 | RESEARCH AND REVIEW | 2-1 |
| | Task Plan | 2-1 |
| | Research Methodology | 2-2 |
| 3 | FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS | 3-1 |
| | Findings | 3-1 |
| | Conclusions | 3-2 |
| 4 | RECOMMENDATIONS | 4-1 |
| 5 | FUTURE PLANS | 5-1 |
| | Development of Alternative Methods for Projecting FMS Manpower Requirements | 5-1 |
| <u>APPENDIXES</u> | | |
| A | OASD(MRA&L) Memorandum, 29 Jan 1979, subject: Development of a Foreign Military Sales Manpower Projection Methodology | A-1 |
| B | SAMAS Project Team Visits | B-1 |
| C | Draft OASD(MRA&L) Memorandum, subject: FYDP Structure Revision for Security Assistance | C-1 |
| D | OASD(MRA&L) Memorandum, 27 Apr 1979, subject: Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS) | D-1 |
| E | Draft DoD Instruction, "Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS)" | E-1 |

SECTION 1
INTRODUCTION

This is the first deliverable report of the General Research Corporation (GRC) on the "Foreign Military Sales (FMS) Manpower Projection Methodology" project. This project was undertaken for the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics) beginning in February 1979 as an outgrowth of earlier work in related areas.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this project is to develop a standard methodology for forecasting the personnel requirements for foreign military sales. To accomplish this objective, the project encompasses three tasks:

1. Improvement of the current Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS), including the formulation and recommendation of necessary revisions to the SAMAS DoDI (1 Feb-31 May 1979).
2. Development of alternative strategies and methods for forecasting future-year manpower requirements to accomplish the FMS programs (1 Feb-30 Sep 1979).
3. Development of the detailed system for forecasting future-year FMS manpower requirements, including the testing of alternatives, the selection and development of a preferred methodology, and the preparation of implementing instructions for the Services (1 Oct 1979-31 Aug 1980).

ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

This report is concerned primarily with Task 1, our review of the current SAMAS report and our recommendations for change/revision/improvement to the system and the DoDI. In Section 2, we describe our task plan and our methods of research and review. In Section 3, we describe

our findings and related conclusions. In Section 4, we present our recommendations for both the system and the instructions. Finally, in Section 5, we outline required continuing actions to improve SAMAS instructions and the accounting system, and set forth our plan for the development of alternative strategies for forecasting, the selection of a preferred method, and the development and implementation of the forecasting system.

SECTION 2
RESEARCH AND REVIEW

TASK PLAN

Our contractual plan for Task 1, Improvement of SAMAS, included the following:

- Provide guidance on the implementation of the DoDI
- Provide guidance on initial reports by the Services
- Review the initial SAMAS inputs, identify errors and anomalies, and refine the Service data
- Visit selected commands
- Prepare necessary revisions and clarifications to the SAMAS instructions (DoDI)

Two situations have influenced the logical flow of performance:

- The contract for this project was negotiated and ultimately awarded on 1 February. Thus, certain activities which were planned for initiation in December were deferred. The result has been a compression of time and effort to accommodate a later starting date and still meet an unmodified delivery date.
- The draft SAMAS DoDI was prepared under an earlier contractual effort and furnished to OASD(MRA&L) in July 1978. Although it was staffed and approved, formal publication is still pending. Thus, the Services are submitting data against an unofficial schedule and an equally unofficial set of procedures. As a result, the Services have not been able to prepare or issue formal implementing instructions to the field.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

As soon as the project was confirmed, GRC prepared a memorandum to the Services for approval, signature, and dispatch by OASD(MRA&L)(PM) (see Appendix A). This memorandum announced the project and its purpose, solicited the cooperation of the Services and Defense agencies, and requested the designation of a Service point of contact. Immediately, the GRC study team established contact with each Service representative. These initial contacts set the stage for all that followed.

Our research into and review of the SAMAS reporting system (and specifically the Service submissions of January 1979) took two forms: face-to-face liaison and discussion with Service proponents, preparers, and coordinators of the SAMAS reports; and a detailed review and evaluation of the actual SAMAS reports submitted by the Services. These two efforts were accomplished concurrently.

Close liaison has been maintained with Service representatives throughout the project. This relationship has been exploited effectively to provide: necessary access to and copies of Service files, records, and reports; access to key staff personnel of the military Services in both the departmental headquarters and departmental field operating activities within the Washington metropolitan area; and, the identification, selection, and arrangements for visiting various field commands outside of the Washington metropolitan area. Appendix B provides a table of field organizations visited.

Overall, our contacts have been frequent and effective. Once a visit was arranged either locally or away, the Service representatives accompanied the GRC team on the interviews, briefings, and discussions. We have achieved a level of "cross Service" review with, for example, a Navy representative accompanying the GRC team on an Air Force visit and an Air Force representative accompanying the team on an Army trip. Each of our initial staff visits followed a similar pattern:

- Orientation of the Services on the FMS Manpower project
- Orientation of the study team on security assistance program activities within the organizations visited
- Detailed discussion on reporting methods, problems, guidance, assumptions, and Service recommendations for change or improvement to SAMAS
- Detailed discussion of forecasting (estimating) procedures (if any) for future year FMS manpower requirements

In many cases, follow-on contacts have been made--by phone, by mail, or in person--in order to clarify, amplify, or confirm information obtained or conclusions drawn from the visit. The Services have been both open and enthusiastic in their cooperation.

Meanwhile, the GRC has assembled a large volume of printed material for analysis, review, and understanding. Our staff has used the available documentation to make a number of detailed reviews involving comparative statistical data. The most productive of these analyses were:

- A line by line comparison of Service SAMAS reports for January 1979 with the Service FMS administrative and MAP administrative/logistical budgets.
- A detailed review of the program element (PE) codes reported in the Service SAMAS against the FYDP structure and PE definitions.
- A comparison of the reports submitted by Service training commands.

Numerous errors and inconsistencies were found and reported to the services.

For purposes of Task 2, GRC has also conducted an intensive review of the DSAA(AR) 1100 Report and the Letter of Request (LOR) Subsystem. Our purpose has been to discover methods for determining such data as the average time from receipt of an LOR by the implementing agency to the acceptance of a letter of offer by the customer, and the average time from the date of acceptance of a letter of offer to the date of case completion or closure. If obtainable, such data might be useful for the development of statistical manpower relationships by FMS case for use in the forecasting tasks.

A number of documents of potential use in the forecasting phase have been obtained during field visits. To date, these have been reviewed only as they influenced the revision of the SAMAS DoDI.

Upon completion of our staff interviews and field visits, and our detailed review of SAMAS reports:

- o GRC drafted an OASD(MRA&L) memo to OASD(C)(Appendix C) which requests changes to the FYDP structure for security assistance. It would initiate one PE, terminate one PE and redesignate/redefine two others. The draft memo has been furnished to the Services for informal coordination.
- o GRC drafted an OASD(MRA&L) memo which was signed and forwarded to the Services (Appendix D). It reported details of our finding of errors, inconsistencies, and anomalies in the SAMAS reports. Following publication of the memo, GRC met separately with staff members of each Service and the Defense Logistics Agency to review issues raised by our analysis, including Service recommendations for improvement to SAMAS and/or the DoDI.

The unpublished DoDI has been reviewed in detail to determine the exact nature and format of changes required to reflect the experience

gained by DoD and the Services in preparing the January SAMAS report. Required changes have been incorporated in the DoDI which is provided, in its currently drafted form, in Appendix E.

SECTION 3
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

FINDINGS

Many of our specific findings have already been reported to and reviewed with the Services. In most cases, corrective action has been initiated.

Departmental staff proponents have provided little guidance to their field reporting activities beyond the contents of the draft DoDI.

- Until the DoDI is official, the requirement to publish implementing instructions is unofficial and uncertain.
- Until 30 March, there was disagreement within the Army over staff responsibility for SAMAS. This responsibility has now been assumed by DCSPER.

Many of the organizations specified in the draft DoDI were not reported in the January SAMAS: either their manpower requirements had been reported by the next higher headquarters or they had no FMS manpower to report. The failure of all organizations to report limits the amount and detail of information available to and required by the OASD.

None of the military Services reported the source or estimation method of their manpower figures. This requirement was exempted by OASD only for this reporting period. Failure to report the source of data is contrary to a GAO finding that OASD should know the methods used to forecast manpower requirements.

All MAAG manpower was reported as administrative instead of by specific function as required by the draft DoDI.

There were many disparities between the man-year figures in the MAP/FMS administrative budgets and those reported in the administrative

portion of SAMAS. These disparities included: higher figures in one report than the other and military personnel reported instead of civilian personnel or vice versa.

There is confusion and error in the selection of program elements (PEs) to be reported in SAMAS. The current PE structure does not adequately cover security assistance organizations.

For the most part, manpower projections are straightlined. This is, of course, the problem which development of a forecasting methodology (Phases II and III of this project) is intended to resolve.

There is a variety of methods used to determine future manpower needs, many of which are inadequate. These include: historical data plus known requirements; using numbers of requisitions as a basis for workload; training planning conferences, etc.

CONCLUSIONS

In general, the DoD components and DSAA have failed to recognize either the importance of SAMAS or the urgency for improved manpower forecasts. There has been little, if any, effort to provide detailed guidance beyond the draft DoDI or to hold training conferences. Both guidance and training seem to be required for a complex new system such as SAMAS. We anticipate that staff attitudes and the accuracy of data will improve only with continued OSD review, policing, and emphasis on SAMAS.

The errors, inconsistencies, and misinterpretations are the direct result of:

- Unpublished DoDI
- Unpublished Service implementing instructions

- Inadequate supervision/coordination at reporting levels
- Inadequate program element structure and definitions for security assistance

These errors, inconsistencies, and misinterpretations can be minimized by the publication of the revised draft DoDI; implementation of a revised FYDP PE structure for security assistance; and most importantly, by the continuing review and aggressive disciplining of Service SAMAS submissions.

SECTION 4
RECOMMENDATIONS

Proposed revisions to the DoDI have been furnished to OASD(MRA&L) and incorporated in the coordinated draft DoDI to be published (Appendix E).

Proposed revisions to the program element structure for security assistance were included in the draft OASD(MRA&L) memo (Appendix C).

We recommend the following actions:

1. Publish the coordinated draft DoDI (as revised) without delay.
2. Transmit the recommended changes to the PE structure for security assistance for staffing and implementation.
3. Continue to subject future Service SAMAS reports to thorough review and analysis, and require corrective actions and, where appropriate, resubmissions.
4. Use Service SAMAS reports to verify and support DSAA budget inputs.

SECTION 5
FUTURE PLANS

As pointed out in Section 2, we have concentrated our primary Task 1 efforts on the review of the SAMAS reporting system. In addition, we gathered both data and documentation pertinent to the development of alternative methods for forecasting foreign military sales manpower.

During the next phase, we will concentrate our primary Task 2 efforts on the development and articulation of alternative strategies and methods for projecting (forecasting) future year manpower requirements for the Foreign Military Sales program. In addition, we will continue to review the SAMAS reporting procedures and results in order to provide input to DoD guidance.

DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE METHODS FOR PROJECTING FMS MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS

We will continue our functional research into methods currently used by the Services or Service field activities to project future year FMS manpower requirements. Our research will include:

- Detailed review of forecasting documentation already collected from the Services to establish the applicability of these procedures.
- Detailed review of reports, documents, and data available in DSAA and the Services for the isolation and identification of possible procedures.
- Additional staff and field visits to examine both data sources and current procedures.

Based on our research findings and our evaluation of methods either available or feasible, we will develop a rationale for and describe the

general parameters of several alternative methods of projecting future year FMS manpower requirements. At this point, we anticipate the development of three basic methodologies for forecasting with a fourth option of using more than one of the three in combinations:

- Micro Method: case by case/installation by installation forecasts of manpower based on detailed historical data for each case (or all cases) using established time, dollar, function, commodity, or service criteria and standards.
- Macro Method: Forecasts of manpower to be based on the gross relationship of manpower to such factors as total number of cases or total dollar value of all cases.
- Discrete Method: Forecasts of manpower to be based on a specific workload standard for a functional support program. For example, the manpower requirement per student in a service training program or the manpower requirements per requisition in a service supply program.
- A combination of one or more discrete methods with either a micro method or a macro method to encompass the FMS universe.

Finally, we will prepare a report to OASD(MRA&L) which outlines:

- Our recommended improvements to current SAMAS (if any).
- Our presentation of a variety of feasible alternative methods for projecting future year FMS manpower requirements and a rationale for each.

APPENDIX A

(Program Management)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (MANPOWER AND RESERVE
AFFAIRS)
THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MANPOWER, RESERVE
AFFAIRS AND LOGISTICS)
THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (MANPOWER, RE-
SERVE AFFAIRS AND INSTALLATIONS)

SUBJECT: Development of a Foreign Military Sales Manpower Projection
Methodology

As an extension of the development of a Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS), OASD(MRA&L) has obtained the services of the General Research Corporation to develop a standardized system to forecast manpower usage in Foreign Military Sales. The study will encompass methods of taking into account pending sales agreements and completed cases, as well as current approved cases and backlogs. Also to be included will be an attempt to assess the impact of potential logistic support for and items previously delivered. The feasibility and desirability of developing statistical manpower estimating relationships by type of case, by function, and on a gross basis will be studied.

The objective of this project will be to develop a standard methodology for forecasting personnel requirements for Foreign Military Sales which OSD can prescribe for application by the military Services. It is anticipated that this methodology will be used in manpower programming, including SAMAS reporting; preparation of the security assistance part of Program Objective Memoranda; and for requesting adjustments in manpower ceilings. The product of this methodology would be improved statements and justification of manpower requirements as provided in the annual budget and the Defense Manpower Requirements Report.

Members of the General Research Corporation team working on this study are shown in Enclosure 1. Initially, the team will be examining current methods of forecasting future workloads and manpower requirements, and the availability and usefulness of case records.

In order to facilitate the study, please designate and advise this office by February 2, 1979 of an individual to act as the central point of contact. Call Mr. Douglas Farbrother (X-50626), the OSD project official for this study.

SIGNED

Enclosure

Robert A. Stone
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary

cc: OSD(C)
DSAA
DLA
DCAA

GENERAL RESEARCH CORPORATION (GRC) CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Security Clearance</u> |
|---|---------------------------|
| Loome, James (Project Manager) | Secret |
| Uscher, Arthur (Principal Investigator) | Top Secret |
| Langberg, Mark | Secret |
| Chesley, Thelma | Top Secret |

APPENDIX B

SAMAS Project Team Visits

Defense Security Assistance Agency, OASD(ISA), Pentagon
Defense Logistics Agency, Cameron Station, VA

US Army

US Army Security Assistance Center, Alexandria, VA
US Army Security Assistance Center, New Cumberland, PA
US Army Depot Support Command, Chambersburg, PA
US Army Training and Doctrine Command, Ft Monroe, VA
Office, Chief of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

US Navy

Office, Chief of Naval Operations, Arlington, VA
Office, Chief of Naval Materiel, Arlington, VA
Naval Supply Systems Command, Arlington, VA
Naval Training Command, Pensacola, FL
HQ, US Marine Corps, Rosslyn, VA

USAF

Directorate of International Programs, USAF, Pentagon
Air Force Logistics Command, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH
International Logistics Center, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH
Air Force Systems Command, Andrews AFB, MD
Tactical Air Command, Langley AFB, VA

APPENDIX C

MEMO FOR DIRECTOR, PROGRAM AND FINANCIAL CONTROL, OASD(C)
SUBJECT: FYDP Structure Revision for Security Assistance

Program Element (PE) 020020, Foreign Military Sales Support, Reimbursable, was revised several years ago to account for personnel supporting Foreign Military Sales (FMS) on a full time basis and reimbursed from direct case funds. That action was considered by both this office and DSAA to be a temporary expedient pending the development of a permanent system to account for all security assistance manpower. As a result, the Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS) was developed and is now in operation.

It is recommended that PE 020020 be discontinued. Manpower now included in this PE should be returned to the appropriate organizational or functional PE.

The military services may object to the discontinuance of PE 020020 since it provides a means for control of a portion of FMS manpower. However, it excludes the bulk of FMS manpower (part time personnel and personnel reimbursed from administrative and accessorial surcharges). The services have the means to account for all FMS manpower in partial program elements. The basic position of this office is that unless all FMS manpower can be identified within a distinct PE structure, it is impractical to identify only a small part. Also, it is evident from the SAMAS reports that PE 020020 has been used incorrectly by all services.

Two other program elements for security assistance, PE 010090, Service Support to OSD/DSAA, MAP (Reimbursable) and PE 010110, Services

MEMO FOR DIRECTOR, PROGRAM AND FINANCIAL CONTROL, OASD(C) Date:
SUBJECT: FYDP Structure Revision for Security Assistance Page: 2

Support to OSD/DSAA, MAP (Non-Reimbursable), have also been a source of confusion and incorrect FYDP reporting. These program elements require redefinition and expansion to account for MAAG personnel reimbursed from FMS funds.

It is recommended that PE 010090 and PE 010110 be retitled and re-defined as follows and Unified Command manpower now included in these PEs be reported under an appropriate PE in Program 2:

010090(A,F,M,N) - MAAGs

(Includes all manpower assigned to MAAGs. A separate PE for MAAGs is desirable because there is a congressionally imposed ceiling on MAAGs).

010110(A,F,N) - Service Support to DSAA

(Includes all military manpower assigned to DSAA. Separate PEs for manpower reimbursed from MAP and from FMS are not believed to be necessary.)

Revised program element definitions are attached.

It is recommended that a new program element for security assistance be established as follows. PE definition is attached:

010120(A,F,N) - Security Assistance

(Includes all manpower assigned to separate organizations and activities devoted to security assistance and not in MAAGs or management headquarters. There is no appropriate PE for these activities and they have been included in PEs which were inappropriate.)

MEMO FOR DIRECTOR, PROGRAM AND FINANCIAL CONTROL, OASD(C) Date:
SUBJECT: FYDP Structure Revision for Security Assistance Page: 3

As a result of these changes, military Services should make and submit the necessary changes to affected PEs, e.g., PE 711120.

Doug Farbrother
Director
Manpower Management

Attachments

PROGRAM ELEMENT DEFINITIONS

MAAGs

010090(A,F,M,N)

Includes military and civilian manpower in all DoD elements located in a foreign country with assigned responsibilities for carrying out security assistance management functions under Section 515 of the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) (PL87-195). Includes such elements as Military Assistance Advisory Group, Defense Representative, Office of Defense Cooperation, Liaison Group, and Defense Attache personnel designated to perform security assistance functions under Section 515(f) of the FAA.

Excludes TOA (costs)

TAFTS

Manpower in unified commands.

Manpower on temporary duty such as mobile training teams.

PROGRAM ELEMENT DEFINITIONS

Service Support to DSAA

010110(A,F,N)

Includes military manpower assigned to the Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA.)

Excludes TOA (costs)

PROGRAM ELEMENT DEFINITIONS

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Security Assistance | 010120(A,F,N) |
| <p>Includes military and civilian manpower in separate organizations and activities devoted to Security Assistance, but not in Management Headquarters or in MAAGs. Includes</p> <p>Army: US Army Security Assistance Center (USASAC) US Army Security Assistance Agency, Latin America (USASAALA) Project Manager, Saudi Arabia National Guard (PMSANG) Technical Assistance Field Teams (TAFTS)</p> <p>Navy: Naval International Control Office (NAVILCO) Saudi Naval Expansion Program (SNEP, PM-5) Technical Assistance Field Teams (TAFTS)</p> <p>Air Force: Security Assistance Accounting Center (SAAC) Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management (DISAM) International Logistics Center, AFLC Technical Assistance Field Teams (TAFTS)</p> <p>Excludes TOA (costs) Management Headquarters MAAGs</p> | |
| | |

APPENDIX D

(Program Management)

27 April 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MANPOWER, RESERVE AFFAIRS AND LOGISTICS)

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (MANPOWER, RESERVE AFFAIRS AND INSTALLATIONS)

SUBJECT: Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS)

- References:
- a. Draft DoDI No. 1100.XI, subject as above.
 - b. Military Department Responses to OSD Budget Call Requiring Submission of FMS Administrative Budgets by 1 October 1978.
 - c. Military Department Responses to OSD Budget Call Requiring Submission of MAP Administrative/Logistics Budgets by 25 August 1978.
 - d. Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS) Report of January 1979.
 - e. FYDP Program Structure Codes and Titles Directory - All DoD Components (Handbook DoD 7045.7-H), dated October 1978.

A review has been completed of the SAMAS report submitted in January, and a number of errors and inconsistencies have been found. I am providing this information to help you improve the quality of both the SAMAS reports and the Security Assistance budgets.

Enclosure 1 shows the most significant differences between the man years reported in the FMS and MAP administrative budgets and the SAMAS report.

Enclosure 2 lists other errors, or apparent errors, found in examination of the SAMAS inputs.

Some organizations were not reported as required by reference a. If this results from a command having no security assistance manpower, please note that fact in transmitting future SAMAS reports. Also, if there will not be any future manpower for a particular command, submit a request to delete the reporting requirement.

OASD(MR&L) (PM) (MC)/Mr. Farbrother/hbb/X50626/27 Apr 79

AED(MR&L) File Copy
AED(MR&L) Read Copy

DAED(PH) File Copy
DAED(PH) (MC) Chron Copy
DAED(PH) (MC) Mr. Farbrother Copy
DAED(PH) (MC) Mr. Walsh Copy


It will not be necessary to make any corrections in accounting for manpower in program element 02002 at this time since action is being initiated to eliminate this program element.

Please try to correct as many errors and inconsistencies as possible in time for the next (May) SAMAS Report. Since separate Security Assistance Manpower tables are not required in the POM submission, the May SAMAS report will serve as the POM input.

Thank you for your cooperation.

2 Enclosures a/s

cc: DEAA Compt.
OASD(PALE)
OASD(C) Accounting Policy


Douglas Farbrother
Acting Director
Manpower Management

AIR FORCE

Man Year Comparison of FMS Administrative Budget and SAMAS Report

| COMMAND | BUDGET | 1978 | | | 1979 | | | 1980 | | |
|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | BUDGET | VARIANCE | SAMAS | BUDGET | VARIANCE | SAMAS | BUDGET | VARIANCE | SAMAS |
| Hq. USAF | Mil. Civ. | 79 47 | 12 10 | 91 57 | | | | | | |
| AFLC | Mil. Civ. | 199 2,132 | (72) (56) | 127 2,076 | 142 2,735 | (29) (92) | 113 2,643 | 144 2,813 | (31) (74) | 113 2,739 |
| TAC | Mil. Civ. | 24 4 | 16 (1) | 40 3 | | | | | | |
| AFAFSC | Mil. Civ. | 13 127 | (9) 39 | 4 166 | | | | | | |
| AFSC | Mil. Civ. | 184 627 | 47 356 | 231 983 | 199 831 | 39 151 | 238 982 | 203 833 | 23 68 | 226 901 |
| MAC | Mil. Civ. | 1 3 | 8 6 | 9 9 | 3 6 | 6 5 | 9 11 | 3 8 | 6 3 | 9 11 |
| ATC | Mil. Civ. | 54 53 | (19) (12) | 35 41 | 58 66 | (22) (19) | 36 47 | 58 66 | (22) (19) | 36 47 |

Man Year Comparison of MAP Administrative Budget and SAMAS Report

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------|---------|----------|----------|--------|------------|----------|--------|------------|----------|
| Hq. USAF | Mil. Civ. | 0 6 | - (3) | 0 3 | 1 6 | (1) (3) | 0 3 | 1 6 | (1) (3) | 0 3 |
| AFLC | Mil. Civ. | 0 0 | 5 265 | 5 265 | 0 0 | 5 266 | 5 266 | 0 0 | 5 266 | 5 266 |
| TAC | Mil. Civ. | 0 0 | 3 10 | 3 10 | 0 0 | 3 10 | 3 10 | 0 0 | 3 10 | 3 10 |
| ATC | Mil. Civ. | 2 11 | 2 11 | 0 0 | 2 9 | 2 9 | 0 0 | 2 9 | 2 9 | 0 0 |
| AFSC | Civ. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

NAVY

Man Year Comparison of FMS Administrative Budget and SAMAS Report

| <u>COMMAND</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> | <u>1978</u> | | | <u>1979</u> | | | <u>1980</u> | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | | <u>SAMAS</u> | <u>VARIANCE</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> | <u>SAMAS</u> | <u>VARIANCE</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> | <u>SAMAS</u> | <u>VARIANCE</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> |
| CNET | MIL. Civ. | 2 36 | (2) 2 | 2 61 | 0 49 | (2) (12) | 2 61 | 0 57 | (2) (4) | |
| Atlantic Fleet | MIL. Civ. | 1 3 | (1) (3) | 1 4 | 0 0 | (1) (4) | 1 4 | 0 0 | (1) (4) | |
| Pacific Fleet | MIL. | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| <u>Man Year Comparison of MAP Administrative Budget and SAMAS Report</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nav. Sup. Sys. Cmd. Civ. | | 5 | 15 | 5 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 12 | 7 | |
| NAVJCO | Civ. | 0 | 29 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 12 | 12 | |
| PACOM | Civ. | 5 | (4) | 6 | 1 | (5) | 6 | 1 | (5) | |

ARMY

Man Year Comparison of MAP Administrative Budget and SAMAS Report

| <u>COMMAND</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> | <u>1978</u> | | | <u>1979</u> | | | <u>1980</u> | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | | <u>SAMAS</u> | <u>VARIANCE</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> | <u>SAMAS</u> | <u>VARIANCE</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> | <u>SAMAS</u> | <u>VARIANCE</u> | <u>BUDGET</u> |
| TRADOC | MIL. Civ. | | | 1 4 | 5 6 | 4 2 | 1 4 | 5 7 | 4 3 | |
| USACC | Civ. | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | |
| PACOM | MIL. | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 25 | |
| SOUTHCOM | MIL. | 13 | (7) | 11 | 6 | (5) | 11 | 6 | (5) | |
| EUCOM | MIL. | 26 | (17) | 26 | 9 | (17) | 26 | 9 | (17) | |
| <u>Man Year Comparison of MAP Logistics Budget and SAMAS Report</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| ARRCOM | Civ. | 13 | 17 | 32 | 37 | 5 | 32 | 37 | 5 | |

SAMAS REPORT ERRORS

Navy

Seven commands are incorrectly reporting FMS direct case manpower in seventeen program elements other than 02002 or management headquarters.

It does not appear that all accessorial manpower is being reported.

FMS administrative manpower is incorrectly listed under program element 02002 in Office, Chief of Naval Operations.

There are a few instances in which end strength figures exceed the man year figures reported.

Army

Ten commands are incorrectly reporting FMS direct case manpower in eighteen program elements other than 02002 or management headquarters.

It does not appear that all accessorial manpower is being reported.

Both ARRCOM and DESCOM incorrectly report manpower under program element 71111.

MIRCOM reports end strength figures which are greater than the man year figures under program element 78017.

USASAALA, SOUTHCOM, EUCOM, MAAGS, DACS, USASAC, FORSCOM and USAFAC are incorrectly reporting manpower under program element 01011.

USASAALA is incorrectly reporting FMS manpower under program element 01009.

Air Force

Both AFLC and ATC are incorrectly reporting MAP manpower under program element 02002.

Manpower data were not submitted for the following commands as required by reference a.:

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Air University | Security Assistance Accounting Center |
| AF Data Automation Agency | Warner Robins Air Logistics Center |
| Pacific Command | San Antonio Air Logistics Center |
| European Command | Sacramento Air Logistics Center |
| Southern Command | Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center |
| Technical Assistance Field | Ogden Air Logistics Center |
| Team - Iran | AF Acquisition Logistics Division |
| Defense Institute of Security | |
| Assistance Management | |



NUMBER

Department of Defense Instruction

SUBJECT Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS)

References:

- (a) Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Public Law 87-195, as amended
- (b) Arms Export Control Act, Public Law 90-629
- (c) DoD Directive 7045.7, "The Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System," October 29, 1969
- (d) thru (f) see enclosure 4

A. PURPOSE

1. This Instruction establishes and provides procedural guidance for the Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS). Security assistance activities are governed by references (a) and (b).

2. Manpower data provided through this system will support:

- a. Budget estimates and justification.
- b. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report.
- c. Program Objective Memoranda (POM) preparation and review.
- d. Congressional reports.
- e. Congressional and other inquiries.

B. APPLICABILITY AND SCOPE

1. The provisions of this Instruction apply to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Military Departments, the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Defense Agencies (hereinafter referred to collectively as DoD Components).

2. Initially, the only Defense Agencies required to provide reports under this Instruction are the Defense Security Assistance Agency, the Defense Logistics Agency, and the Defense Contract Audit Agency. In the event they provide services for security assistance, other Defense Agencies will likewise provide necessary reports.

3. The provisions of this Instruction encompass SAMAS reporting which includes all Defense manpower utilization (actuals and projected) in support of security assistance activities, comprising the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program, the Military Assistance Program (MAP), and International Military Education and Training (IMET), (references (a) and (b)). For the purposes of SAMAS, IMET will be reported as part of MAP.

C. POLICY

1. SAMAS is a manpower reporting system, an integral part of the information base supporting the DoD Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (DoD Directive 7045.7, reference (c)), and serves as a subsystem of the Five Year Defense Program (FYDP). Although most SAMAS data will not be separately identifiable in the FYDP (i.e., SAMAS consists primarily of partial program elements), the data for past, current, and future fiscal years will essentially be consistent with manpower levels in the FYDP.

2. SAMAS includes all manpower in support of security assistance regardless of funding source. SAMAS data will equate to personnel data in the FMS and MAP administrative budgets and in the quarterly report required by Section 36 (a) (9) of the Arms Export Control Act, except for differences caused by time of preparation and by DoD guidance which assigns some of the cost of administering certain security assistance efforts to the DoD components. The latter relates, for example, to FMS training cases with NATO for which recoupment of the administrative surcharge is waived and to the MAP administrative budget which excludes certain military personnel costs.

3. Authorizations of both military and civilian manpower will be based on the best estimate of expected man-year utilization and of expected actual strength at the end of each fiscal year.

D. PROCEDURES

1. Source of Data. Data for the SAMAS report will be based on actual installation/activity level workload and manpower expenditures rather than being produced by command/headquarters level projections. If the installation/activity does not now have a system for recording or computing workload and man-hour data for security assistance, such a system will be developed.

a. Manpower standards may be used in conjunction with workload reports to determine manpower expenditures. It is not necessary for detailed timekeeping to be used; estimates of time expended are acceptable provided these are made in or organizationally close to the unit where work occurs.

b. In all cases, auditable backup records supporting estimates will be retained for a period of three years.

c. The requirement to collect data at the activity/unit level does not preclude the accumulation of data at the command/headquarters level through work measurement systems that are responsive to SAMAS reporting requirements.

2. Guidance to the Field. The Military Departments and major subordinate headquarters shall improve and standardize methods for the collection of security assistance manpower data, recognizing that different methods may be required for different functional areas, and that the methods may be dependent upon the nature of manpower standards available. Information copies of all guidance or directives implementing this DoDI, or amendments thereto, will be routinely forwarded to OASD(MRA&L)(PM).

3. Programming Guidance. Headquarters of the Military Departments and intermediate headquarters, as appropriate, will provide programming guidance to installations and activities to establish a basis for estimating future manpower requirements for security assistance.

a. Guidance should include information on anticipated volume of activity for specific cases and the increase or decrease in overall security assistance activity levels.

b. Guidance is particularly required for those activities that do not act on security assistance cases directly, but do provide services for security assistance for other Department of Defense organizations, e.g., test and evaluation activities.

4. Case, Weapon System, and Country Identification. Occasionally, there will be a need for the Department of Defense to respond to questions regarding numbers of personnel or man-years devoted to or scheduled for certain cases or countries, or located within a particular country. The Military Departments should be able to respond readily to inquiries regarding how many estimated personnel/man-years are utilized (a) in support of each of the large dollar-volume FMS countries (e.g., Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel), (b) in support of major weapon systems, and (c) in support of major cases.

5. MAAG and Unified Command Manpower. Military Departments will report on those manpower in Unified Commands and in Military Advisory Assistance Groups (MAAGs) for which they have budgeting and programming responsibility. The OJCS will arrange for identification of manpower (identified as full time or part time) used for FMS, MAP, and IMET support on Joint Tables of Distribution (JTD). The Military Departments will use these JTD to develop the manpower data required for Unified Commands, and to support MAAG manpower data. Accordingly, manpower allowances will be reported rather than actual on-board personnel.

E. RESPONSIBILITIES

1. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics) is responsible for policies, procedures, and data collection and dissemination for SAMAS.

2. The Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, is responsible for the policies, procedures, compilation of data, and the reporting to Congress for the Quarterly Analysis of FMS Manpower.

3. The DoD Components will implement and operate both of the reporting systems in accordance with the procedures contained in this Instruction, and will ensure that the information reported is reliable and responsible. In addition, points of contact will be designated and submitted to the ASD(MRA&L) and the Director, DSAA, within 30 days.

F. SECURITY ASSISTANCE MANPOWER ACCOUNTING SYSTEM (SAMAS)

1. Format. Inputs will be submitted in machine readable format in accordance with the instructions in enclosure 1. Defense Agencies (DSAA, DLA, DCAA) may use locally adapted forms for manually prepared inputs. A format for this purpose or for use as feeder reports is outlined in enclosure 2.

2. Coverage. Reports will cover total worldwide security assistance manpower utilization, separated into FMS (exclusive of MAAGs), MAP (exclusive of MAAGs), and MAAGs.

3. Reports by Organization. Military Department submissions will provide a separate breakdown for each major subordinate organization and each separate, full-time security assistance organization.

a. Separate reporting will also be required for each subordinate activity of the Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command, the Naval Material Command, and the Air Force Logistics Command. Separate consolidated reporting is also required for MAAGs.

b. A listing of organizations, with codes, for which reporting is required, is prescribed in enclosure 3. If additional organizational codes are required, a request should be made to the ASD(MRA&L).

4. Program Elements. In reporting program element (PE) codes, use only the six-digit OSD codes prescribed in the DoD FYDP Program Structure Handbook (reference (d)). Reporting Components must provide their field activities and subordinate commands with instructions which will enable them to conform with this requirement.

5. Report Frequency. SAMAS inputs will be submitted three times per year to coincide with each regularly scheduled update of the Five Year Defense Program (FYDP): in October, to reflect the budget submission; in January, to reflect budget decisions as shown in the President's budget; and in May, to reflect the POM input (at the basic level).

6. Fiscal Years. Each submission will be for 4 fiscal years: the prior year, the current year, and the 2 following years. For example, the report due in October 1979 will be for FY 1979 through FY 1982. Each May, the old prior year will be dropped and a future year added.

7. Manpower Estimates and Computations

a. General. Manpower computations and estimates will be based on actual and projected workload, manning standards, and man-hour accounting reports. Where there is no exact basis, estimates will be based on reasonable assumptions and the best data available. Auditable backup records will be maintained, including, as appropriate, descriptions of how data was developed and accumulated.

b. Overhead Manpower

(1) For the purposes of this instruction, overhead consists of base operating support and other manpower providing overall management and administration to an installation or separate activity. Where overhead supports both security assistance and other Defense activities, there is a need to determine what part of the overhead may be chargeable to security assistance.

(2) Overhead manpower may be Direct Case, Administrative, or Accessorial. Overhead allocations will be made only when the allocation computation results in more than one man-year of overhead effort being assigned to security assistance. In Management Headquarters (DoD Directive 5100.73, reference (e)), only manpower directly involved in security assistance will be reported and overhead allocations will not be made.

c. Direct Case Manpower

(1) This is time charged to the case as a line item. Man-hours charged, divided by the number of productive man-hours in a man-year (1733)^{1/} determines number of man-years.

(2) At industrially-funded activities, both "direct" and "overhead" man-years need to be determined. Usually, the number of "direct" labor hours charged is available. If not, the average cost per hour can be determined and divided into the total security assistance personnel cost to determine man-hours expended.

1/ Derivation:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Total hours | | 52 weeks x 40 hrs = 2080 | |
| Less: | | | |
| | Leave | = | 160 hrs |
| | Sick | = | 80 hrs |
| | Holiday & other | = | <u>107 hrs</u> |
| Productive hours | | | <u>347</u> 1733 hrs |

(3) Similar computations need to be made for personnel whose costs are included in tuition rates (see DoDI 2140.1, reference (f)).

(4) Overhead manpower in industrial fund activities and at training activities normally are Direct Case manpower and will be computed on the same basis as overhead costs included in the computation of industrial fund rates and tuition rates (see DoDI 2140.1, reference (f)). The personnel costs included in overhead can be determined, an average cost per man-year developed, and the resulting computation (overhead cost charged to the case: average cost of overhead man-years equals equivalent man-years) determines the overhead man-years to be added.

d. Administrative and Accessorial Overhead Manpower. To compute allocations of Administrative and Accessorial manpower in overhead activities, each installation and other reporting activity will make a determination as to what percentage of overhead is relatively fixed (i.e., tends not to vary with changes in volume of activity) and what percentage is relatively variable (i.e., tends to vary with changes in volume of activity). If not previously established, a one-time study may be required to make this determination. Allocation calculations of overhead manpower for security assistance will use only the variable portion of overhead as determined by the study.

(1) Variable manpower will be considered as synonymous with incremental manpower, i.e., those overhead manpower spaces that would be appropriate to be added or withdrawn as FMS Administrative and Accessorial activities are added or withdrawn.

(2) To illustrate, consider an installation with 200 overhead positions (including base operating support and manpower providing overall management and administration). A determination is made that 120 of the positions are relatively fixed and the remaining 80 are relatively variable. If 5% of the total productive (nonoverhead) man-years of the installation are for FMS Administrative activities, then 5% of the 80 variable overhead positions (or 4 man-years) will be added to the FMS Administrative man-year quantities. These man-years would usually be in a base operations program element.

(3) Base operating support (BOS) man-years should be included as FMS Administrative man-years only to the extent that BOS man-years have been or will be augmented to support non-BOS FMS Administrative activities and thus would be reduced if the number of FMS Administrative man-years are reduced. The same principle applies to Accessorial man-years.

e. Industrially-Funded Accessorial Manpower. At industrially-funded activities performing accessorial services, including Military

Airlift Command's Aerial Port Terminals and Military Traffic Management Command's Ocean Terminals, the computations of accessorial manpower will be made as described in paragraphs c. and d. above.

f. Overtime. Man-years may include overtime in those instances where security assistance man-hours are estimated by multiplying the number of security-assistance work units by a standard number of man-hours per work unit (since such estimates will not distinguish whether work was or is to be done on regular time or on overtime). However, in those instances where security assistance man-years are based on man-hour accounting data, or on the percentage of time personnel spend on FMS, overtime man-hours will not be included. In such cases, overtime constitutes a cost but not a component of man-years.

8. Source/Estimation Method Codes. The coding structure and record layout for SAMAS (enclosure 1) provide for code entries (field 4, position 12) to show the source or estimation method of each manpower quantity. In using these codes, it is understood that prior year quantities normally will reflect actuals and that future year manpower quantities are adjusted to reflect projections of current workload. In the event that code Ø, "Other", is used, an explanation of the source of data or method of estimation will be included with the submission.

9. Data to be Reported. Definitions of data elements and procedural guidance are contained in enclosure 1.

10. Reports Control Symbol. The SAMAS report is assigned Reports Control Symbol _____.

H. EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. This instruction is effective immediately.

2. Forward two copies of the implementing instruction to the ASD (MRA&L) within 60 days.

Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Manpower, Reserve Affairs and
Logistics)

Enclosures - 4

1. Procedural Guidance for Submission of SAMAS Data
2. Format for SAMAS Report.
3. Reporting Organizations and Codes.
4. List of References

PROCEDURAL GUIDANCE FOR
SUBMISSION OF THE
SAMAS REPORT

A. GENERAL

1. The SAMAS Report will be delivered by DoD Components to the Director for Manpower Management, OASD(MRA&L), on conventional 80-column punched card, or arrangement may be made with the OASD(MRA&L) for submission on magnetic cards. The Defense Agencies may submit a manually prepared report on locally prepared forms.

2. The submission will be accompanied by a memorandum that includes the "as of" date of the data being submitted, the primary Action Officer's name and telephone number, and control totals for each category of manpower (officer, enlisted, US direct hire, foreign direct hire, and foreign indirect hire) for "full time" and "man-years" for each of the four fiscal years reported. Each DoD Component will also provide a direct print-image listing of the machine readable submission.

3. Each report input will be a complete new submission rather than changes from the previous submission.

B. PUNCHED CARD SPECIFICATIONS

When punched cards are used, card decks should be appropriately identified, i.e., SAMAS, Reports Control Symbol (RCS) number, submission date, number of cards, and submitting Component. Conventional 80-character punched cards will be used with format as specified below. Quantities need not be right-justified or zero-filled. However, if a zero entry applies, a zero must be entered in the field.

C. DATA RECORD FORMAT

The record layout format is prescribed in attachment 1 to this enclosure.

| <u>FIELD NO.</u> | <u>DESCRIPTION</u> | <u>CARD POSITION</u> | <u>NO. OF CHARACTERS</u> |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Program Element | 1-6 | 6 AN |
| 2 | Leave Blank (to be used for DPPC) | 7-9 | 3 |
| 3 | Organization | 10-11 | 2 A |
| 4 | Source/Estimation Method | 12 | 1 N |
| 5 | Type of Security Assistance | 13 | 1 A |
| 6 | Method Paid or Reimbursed | 14 | 1 A |
| 7 | Country (Optional) | 15-16 | 2 A |
| 8 | Manpower Type | 17 | 1 A |
| 9 | Full Time - Prior Year | 18-22 | 5 N |
| 10 | Man-years - Prior Year | 23-27 | 5 N |
| 11 | Full Time - Current Year | 28-32 | 5 N |
| 12 | Man-years - Current Year | 33-37 | 5 N |
| 13 | Full Time - Current Year +1 | 38-42 | 5 N |
| 14 | Man-years - Current Year +1 | 43-47 | 5 N |
| 15 | Full Time - Current Year +2 | 48-52 | 5 N |
| 16 | Man-years - Current Year +2 | 53-57 | 5 N |
| 17 | Blank field | 58 | |

D. DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION AND CODE STRUCTURE

Field 1 - Program Element. The program element codes prescribed by DoD Handbook 7045.7-H (reference (d)) will be used.

Field 2 - OSD will enter data in this field to identify the Defense Planning and Programming Category to which the program element is assigned.

Field 3 - Organization. The organization codes listed in enclosure 3 will be used.

Field 4 - Source/Estimation Method. These codes are designed to show the source of data or the method of estimation for each manpower quantity. It is understood that prior year quantities are supposed to be actual and that future year quantities are projections. If more than one method is involved, use the code for the primary method. When "Other", code Ø is used, provide an explanation.

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|---|
| 1 | Financial records/reports |
| 2 | Operations or work order reporting system |

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Engineered standards |
| 4 | Other manning standards |
| 5 | Timekeeping records |
| 6 | Projection from historical/ current data. |
| 7 | Statistical allocation/proration |
| 8 | Approximation/staff estimate |
| 9 | Joint Tables of Distribution |
| Ø | Other |

Field 5 - Type of Security Assistance. There are three types of security assistance.

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-------------|---|
| A = | <u>Foreign Military Sales (FMS)</u> US Government sales of Defense articles and services to foreign governments under the Arms Export Control Act (AECA). Such sales are financed either with cash or with loans extended or guaranteed under the AECA. (MAAGs excluded.) |
| B = | <u>Military Assistance Program (MAP) (also called Grant Aid)</u> Transfers of Defense articles and services to foreign governments as grant aid and loans under the authority of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended. Includes International Military Education and Training (IMET). (MAAGs excluded.) |
| C = | <u>MAAGs</u> Encompasses all DoD elements located in a foreign country with assigned responsibilities for carrying out security assistance management functions under Section 515 of the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) (reference (a)). Used generally, it applies to all such activities regardless of the actual title assigned, e.g., Military Assistance Advisory Group, Defense Representative, Office of Defense Cooperation, Liaison Group, and Defense Attache Personnel designated to perform security assistance functions under Section 515(f), of the FAA. |

Field 6 - Method Paid or Reimbursed. FMS and MAP structures are different in order to relate to the budget system. For FMS activities, all manpower (man-years) will be distributed to Direct Case, Administrative, and Accessorial. All manpower categories include a share of both administrative and support personnel who work directly on FMS and MAP activities (on a full- or part-time basis) and an appropriate share of management and support personnel at installation level. For MAAGs, a series of functional codes are prescribed.

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <u>Foreign Military Sales</u> | |
| D = | <u>Direct Case</u> Manpower, including overhead manpower, whose expenses are directly charged to an FMS case, such as technical assistance advisors, mobile training teams, program activation task forces, management cases, and manpower whose costs are included in the computation of training tuition rates or industrial fund rates. This is applicable only when a defined line for these charges is included in the case or when DoDI 2140.1 (reference (f)) provides for applicable costs to be included and billed as part of hardware and procurement costs. |
| E = | <u>Administrative</u> Manpower whose costs are reimbursed or are subject to reimbursement from the administrative surcharge added to the price of contractual services and material sold to foreign governments for the purpose of recovering DoD costs. Includes military and civilian end strengths and man-years related to the administration of the FMS program, including sales negotiation, case implementation, procurement, administering item discrepancy reports, contract administration, program control, accounting and budgeting, (other than those functions identified for direct charge to an FMS case in accordance with DoDI 2140.1, reference (f)). Includes administration of the FMS training program at major command headquarters. Equates with manpower reported in FMS administrative budget except for differences caused by date of preparation. Includes allocation of overhead manpower. Excludes manpower whose costs are included in computation of tuition rates. |
| F = | <u>Accessorial</u> DoD military and civilian manpower engaged in packing, crating, and handling at storage depots; port loading and unloading in CONUS and overseas; transportation (such as ferrying of manpower or materiel); and prepositioning (placing items in stock in overseas locations); except when the costs of such manpower are directly charged to an FMS case. Includes overhead manpower. |
| <u>Military Assistance Program</u> | |
| G = | <u>Training and Technical Assistance Direct</u> Civilian manpower whose costs are reimbursed from training tuition charges or otherwise directly provided for in a MAP order. Military personnel performing comparable duties (such as training instructors) will also be included in this category. |

H = Administrative

Civilian manpower engaged in "worldwide" administration of MAP (including program planning and development and management in Washington, at major field command headquarters, and at overseas posts) and included in Generic Code (Budget Project) T-10. Military personnel performing comparable duties will also be included in this category. (MAAG personnel will not be included in this category but will be reported separately.)

I = Logistics Management

Civilian manpower involved in "worldwide" MAP material support and logistics management such as supervision, records control, editing, requisition control, ADP, maintenance, and related services. This equates to Generic Code (Budget Project) L-60. Military manpower performing comparable duties will also be included in this category.

J = Accessorial

DoD military and civilian manpower engaged in packing, crating, and handling at storage depots; port loading and unloading in CONUS and overseas; transportation (such as ferrying of manpower or materiel); and prepositioning (placing items in stock in overseas locations).

MAAGS = For MAAGS (Generic Code T 20), the following functional codes are prescribed:

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Function</u> |
|-------------|-------------------------|
| L | Administration |
| M | Logistics Management |
| N | Transportation |
| O | Fiscal Management |
| P | Contract Administration |
| Q | Advisory/Training |

Field 7 - Country - This is reserved for optional use by DoD Components.

Field 8 - Manpower Type

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Destination</u> |
|-------------|---|
| | Military |
| 1 | <u>Officer</u> An active officer of the US Military Services - Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Definition is precisely consistent with FYDP resource identification codes (RICs) 0001 through 0004. Includes warrant officers. |

- 2 Enlisted
An active member of the US Military Services - Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Definition is precisely consistent with RICs 0101 thru 0104.
- 3 Civilian
US Direct Hire (USDH)
US civilians hired directly by the Military Departments or Defense Agencies. Definition is precisely consistent with RIC 0160.
- 4 Foreign Direct Hire (FDH)
Non-US civilians hired abroad directly, under a local wage system. Definition is precisely consistent with RIC 0161.
- 5 Foreign Indirect Hire (FIH)
Foreign employees hired abroad through an arrangement with the host government. Definition is precisely consistent with RIC 0162.

Fields 9, 11, 13, 15 - Full time personnel - end strength
These fields cover full-time personnel for 4 fiscal years (prior, current, current +1, and current +2).
No codes are needed for these fields because they are positionally designated on the input format.
Full time means engaged 90% or more of the time performing security assistance functions, FMS or MAP, as the sole basis for existence of the position. Full time FMS positions may be funded by reimbursement from FMS case funds or the FMS Administrative Trust Fund. For the prior year (field 9), full time end strength actually on board will be reported in the January submission and estimated number on board will be reported in October. For the current and future years authorized full time end strength (which should be the same as projected to be on board) will be reported.

Fields 10, 12, 14, 16 - Man-years
These fields cover man-years for the 4 fiscal years reported.
No codes are needed for these fields because they are positionally designated on the input format.
A man-year consists of the number of man-hours equivalent to one person working full time for 1 year. Man-years means the same as

man-year equivalents or annual average strength. Man-years include both full-time (Fields 9, 11, 13, 15) and part-time personnel engaged in security assistance. (Part time means engaged in FMS or MAP less than 90% of the time.) For the prior year (field 10), actual man-years expended will be reported in January and estimated actuals in October. For current and future years, projected man-year utilization will be reported regardless of authorizations. Man-years will be developed on an incremental basis, but will be rounded to the nearest whole number when reported to OSD. Less than one-half a man-year will be reported as zero.

Field 17 - Blank field.
Attachment - 1
Record Layout - SAMAS

E-17

SECURITY ASSISTANCE MANPOWER REPORT

MIL DEPT/DEF AGENCY _____

| PE CODE _____ ORGANIZATION _____ | PRIOR YEAR | | CURRENT YEAR | | CURR YR +1 | | CURR YR +2 | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY |
| | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS |
| <u>FOREIGN MIL SALES</u> | | | | | | | | |
| <u>DIRECT CASE</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ADMINISTRATIVE</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ACCESSORIAL</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |
| <u>TOTAL FMS</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |

SECURITY ASSISTANCE MANPOWER REPORT (Cont)

| PE CODE _____ ORGANIZATION _____ | PRIOR YEAR | | CURRENT YEAR | | CURR YR +1 | | CURR YR +2 | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY | FY |
| | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS | FULL TIME- END STRENGTH | TOTAL MAN YEARS |
| MILITARY ASST PGM | | | | | | | | |
| <u>TNG & TECH ASST</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ADMINISTRATIVE</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |
| <u>LOGISTICS MGMT</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ACCESSORIAL</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |
| <u>TOTAL MAP</u> | | | | | | | | |
| OFFICER | | | | | | | | |
| ENLISTED | | | | | | | | |
| CIVILIAN | | | | | | | | |
| USDH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN DH | | | | | | | | |
| FOREIGN IH | | | | | | | | |

REPORTING ORGANIZATIONS

The following organizations in the Military Departments will have submissions for both the SAMAS report and the Quarterly Analysis of FMS Manpower. Use the codes as shown for machine readable inputs. If additional codes are required, contact OASD(MRA&L).

| <u>ABBREVIATIONS</u> | <u>ORGANIZATION</u> | <u>CODE</u> |
|----------------------|---|-------------|
| <u>Army</u> | | |
| Hqs, DARCOM | Hqs, US Army Material Development and Readiness Command | AA |
| ARRCOM | Armament Materiel Readiness Command | AB |
| AVRADCOM | Aviation Research and Development Command | AC |
| CERCOM | Communications/Electronics Materiel Readiness Command | AD |
| CORADCOM | Communications Research & Development Command | AE |
| DESCOM | Depot System Command | AF |
| MIRADCOM | Missile Research and Development Command | AH |
| MIRCOM | Missile Materiel Readiness Command | AI |
| NARADCOM | Natick Research and Development Command | AJ |
| PMSANG | Project Manager, Saudi Arabia National Guard | AK |
| TARCOM | Tank-Automotive Materiel Readiness Command | AL |
| TARADCOM | Tank-Automotive Research & Development Command | AM |
| TECOM | Test and Evaluation Command | AN |
| TSARCOM | Troop Support and Aviation Materiel Readiness Command | AO |
| USASAC | US Army Security Assistance Center | AP |
| ALMC | Army Logistics Management Center | AQ |
| ALMSA | Automated Logistics Management Systems Agency | AR |
| AMETA | Army Management Engineering Training Activity | AS |
| PSA | Personnel Support Activity-DARCOM | AT |
| OCE | Office, Chief of Engineers (include field activities) | BA |
| TRADOC | Training and Doctrine Command | BB |
| FORSCOM | Forces Command | BC |
| 8 USARMY | Eighth US Army | BD |
| HSC | Health Services Command | BE |
| ACC | Army Communications Command | BF |
| Hqs, DA | Hqs, Dept of Army (other than specified) | BG |
| PACOM | Pacific Command | BH |
| MAAGs | Military Assistance Advisory Groups | BI |
| USARJ | US Army - Japan | BJ |
| USAREUR | US Army - Europe & Seventh Army | BK |
| USASAALA | US Army Security Assistance Agency - Latin America | BN |
| MTMC | Military Traffic Management Command | BL |
| MDW | Military District of Washington | BM |

| <u>ABBREVIATIONS</u> | <u>ORGANIZATION</u> | <u>CODE</u> |
|----------------------|---|-------------|
| SOUTHCOM | Southern Command | BR |
| EUCOM | European Command | BS |
| OSA | Office, Secretary of Army | BT |
| DACS | Office of Chief of Staff | BU |
| DASG | Surgeon General | BV |
| DAAG | Adjutant General | BW |
| AAA | Army Audit Agency | BX |
| USAFAC | Army Finance & Accounting Center | BY |
| TAFT | Technical Assistance Field Teams | BZ |
| | | |
| <u>Navy</u> | | |
| DEPUNSECNAV | Office of the Secretary of Navy | NA |
| OPNAV | Office of the Chief of Naval Operations | NB |
| NMPC | Naval Military Personnel Command | NC |
| MC | Marine Corps (include Marines in MAAGs) | ND |
| CHNAVMAT HQs | Hqs, Naval Materiel Command | NE |
| Navy Labs | Director of Naval Laboratories | NE |
| CNM SSPO (PM-1) | Proj. Mgr., Strategic Systems Proj. Office | NG |
| CNM SNEP (PM-5) | Proj. Mgr., Saudi Naval Expansion Prog. | NH |
| NAVELEXSYSCOM | Naval Electronics Systems Command | NI |
| NAVSEASYSYSCOM | Naval Sea Systems Command | NJ |
| NAVAIRSYSCOM | Naval Air Systems Command | NK |
| NAVFACENGCOM | Naval Facilities Engineering Command | NL |
| NAVSUPSYSCOM | Naval Supply Systems Command (less NAVILCO) | NM |
| NAVILCO | Naval International Logistics Command | NN |
| CINCLANTFLT | Atlantic Fleet | NO |
| CINCPACFLT | Pacific Fleet | NP |
| CNET | Chief of Naval Education and Training | NQ |
| MAAGs | Military Assistance Advisory Groups | NR |
| TAFT | Technical Assistance Field Teams | NS |
| PACOM | Pacific Command | NT |
| EUCOM | European Command | NU |
| SOUTHCOM | Southern Command | NV |
| | | |
| <u>Air Force</u> | | |
| Hqs, USAF | Hqs, US Air Force | FA |
| AFLC | Air Force Logistics Command | FB |
| TAC | Tactical Air Command | FC |
| AFAA | Air Force Audit Agency | FD |
| AFSS | Air Force Security Service | FE |
| AFOSI | Air Force Office of Special Investigation | FF |
| AFMPC | Air Force Military Personnel Center | FG |
| USAFE | US Air Forces - Europe | FH |
| AFAFC | Air Force Accounting and Finance Center | FI |
| AFSC | Air Force Systems Command | FJ |
| AFDAA | Air Force Data Automation Agency | FL |
| MAC | Military Airlift Command | FM |

| <u>ABBREVIATIONS</u> | <u>ORGANIZATION</u> | <u>CODE</u> |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| ATC | Air Training Command | FN |
| PACAF | Pacific Air Forces | FO |
| AFCS | Air Force Communications Service | FP |
| ADCO | Aerospace Defense Command | FS |
| PACOM | Pacific Command | FT |
| EUCOM | European Command | FU |
| MAAGs | Military Assistance Advisory Groups | FV |
| SOUTHCOM | Southern Command | FW |
| 3G | Air Force Elements, Europe | GH |
| 3V | Air Force Elements | GI |
| 2J | 1947th Administrative Support Group | GJ |

REFERENCES (cont.)

- (d) DoD Handbook 7045.7-H, FYDP Program Structure, latest edition
- (e) DoD Directive 5100.73, "Department of Defense Management Headquarters," April 11, 1975
- (f) DoD Instruction 2140.1, "Pricing of Sales of Defense Articles and Defense Services to Foreign Countries and International Organizations," March 9, 1977